REPORT

KATIMAVIK INTERIM EVALUATION

SECRETARY OF STATE

Submitted By:

THE PASS GROUP

303 - 411 Roosevelt Avenue

Ottawa, Ontario K2A 3X9

728-7708

September 30, 1985

REPORT

KATIMAVIK INTERIM EVALUATION

SECRETARY OF STATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	INTERIM EVALUATION PROJECT METHODOLOGY	3
III.	INFORMATION, DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGIES	5
IV.	CRITIQUES OF SOURCES	8
	A. Economic Impact I	9
	B. Telephone Survey	11
	C. Economic Impact II	14
	D. Evaluation of Katimavik: Effectiveness; Effectiveness Related to Costs	17
	E. Use of the California Psychological Inventory	18
	F. Sponsor Applications	19
	G. Future Procedures	20
	H. Summary of Information/Data Base Comments	21
V.	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS	22
	A. Individual Issue Conclusions	22
	B. Overall Evaluation Commentary	29
	APPENDIX A - ESTIMATED VALUE OF KATIMAVIK'S VOLUNTARY LABOUR	
	APPENDIX B - ANALYSIS OF SPONSOR APPLICATIONS FOR YEAR IX	
	APPENDIX C - REFERENCES	

REPORT

KATIMAVIK INTERIM EVALUATION

SECRETARY OF STATE

I. INTRODUCTION

In August 1985, the Evaluation Directorate of the Secretary of State requested that The Pass Group conduct an interim evaluation of the Katimavik program. This document contains that report.

In structure the report:

A. Outlines the approach used and the associated information and data sources; then,

B. Briefly describes and discusses the methodology used in the data collection and analysis, and provides a critique of this information base including recommendations with respect to future procedures (see IV.F); and, finally,

C. Provides evaluation conclusions on the following effectiveness issues; the wording of these issues has been adapted from, but is not identical to, that in the terms of reference:

1. What opportunities to acquire work skills through work experience are provided the Katimavik participants, and to what degree are skills actually acquired;

2. To what degree does the Katimavik experience lead to better employment histories for participants;

3. How does Katimavik affect the subsequent educational history of participants;

4. What is the economic impact of Katimavik's voluntary labour;

5. What benefits accrue to the communities which have been the site of Katimavik projects;

6. What is the effect of the program on the personal development of the participants.

../3

II. INTERIM EVALUATION PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The request to which this report responds arose from an immediate need for the updating of the evaluation perspective on the Katimavik program. The evaluation had to be conducted, therefore, in a very short period of time. Accordingly, the concentration and focus was on the derivation of those evaluation conclusions which could be drawn from previous evaluation work or in one case from recently assembled raw data on sponsor applications.

Essentially, the project took the following form:

A. The review, for background purposes, of documents prepared in 1983 in conjunction with program evaluation work on Katimavik (References 1 and 7);

B. The review and critiquing of:

1. A recent report on Katimavik's economic effects (Reference 2);

2. A report on a recent telephone survey of graduates (Reference 3); and, the associated OpCan report on that survey (Reference 4);

../4

3. Phase II of the Reference 2 report, which assessed the economic effect on participants, sponsors and host communities (Reference 5);

4. A 1981 evaluation of Katimavik (Reference 6);

C. The analysis of recent (Year IX, 85/86) sponsor applications as an indication of the work histories and skill acquisitions which could be envisaged for next year's participants;

D. The various streams of information and analysis as they pertained to the individual evaluation issues were synthesized; and a similar process was followed to derive the methodological critiques.

../5

III. INFORMATION, DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGIES

Table 1 displays the various information and data sources, the methodology used in those sources, and the interim evaluation project issues to which they relate.

TABLE 1
INFORMATION AND DATA SOURCES

Ref.No.	Short Title	Summary of Methodology	Evaluation Issue(s)
Ref.#1	Katimavik Framework Study	Portrays Katimavik in program evaluation terms: Design, Objectives, Logic Model, Concept/Rationale, Issues, Evaluation Approaches	Background
Ref.#2	Economic Impact I	Categorizes Katimavik jobs and matches them to "standard" categories for wage rate assessment. Develops an assessment of all economic inputs into Katimavik, Years V-VIII.	Issue #4 Economic Impact of Katimavik Labour
Ref.#3	Telephone Survey of Participants	Application of questionnaire to a sample of 403 (Years I through V) graduates stratified to particularly match program year vs province characteristics. Reports estimated results for full population and, where significant, gives demographic variations.	Issue #1 Work Skills Issue #2 Employment; Issue #3 Education

../6

Ref.No.	Short Title	Summary of Methodology	Evaluation Issue(s)
Ref.#4	OpCan Survey Report	Summarizes results of Ref.#3. In one case (Matrix of Before vs Present Occupation) gives additional information.	As for Ref.#3.
Ref.#5	Economic Impact - II	Reports on a survey of sponsors and participants for Year VII; uses these results (and some of Phase I) to assess the economic output of Katimavik; gives the estimated effects on overall economy of an Input/Output simulation of Katimavik.	Issue #5 Community Benefits Issue #2 Employment
Ref.#6	Effectiveness & Cost Effectiveness Evaluation	Reports on questionnaire based interviews and mail surveys of participants, graduates, dropouts and dismissed, non-accepted applicants, community leaders, citizens, sponsors and staff. Psychometric and language tests were administered to participants. (11 instruments used; described in Appendix B of Reference 7)	Issue #5 Community Benefits; Issue #2 Employment; Overall Evaluation Commentary (See pg 23)
Ref.#7	Summary Evaluation Report	Summarizes and synthesizes the Reference 6 work, and an efficiency evaluation of Katimavik by Canadian logic.	Background

../7

Ref.No.	Short Title	Summary of Methodology	Evaluation Issue(s)
Ref.#8	Sponsor Applications	Records work tasks to be performed in project by participant weeks. Analyzed in Appendix B of this report.	Issue #1 Work Skills
Ref.#9	CPI Application Memorandum	Reports on the application of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) to 96 participants and 39 non-participants.	Issue #6 Personal Development

IV. CRITIQUES OF SOURCES

This section is not intended to be a "report card" on the various reports but, rather, to record views with respect to the robustness or specific weaknesses in their findings regarding the issues of this interim evaluation.

Before commenting on the individual documents, two important general points should be made:

- A critical point which must be established, in the evaluation of a social program such as Katimavik, is whether or not the effects which take place within the participant population would have occurred anyway. For social programs this is the manifestation of the general evaluation problem of establishing incrementality. For a program such as Katimavik, this is of particular difficulty as the population of participants is self selected - thereby automatically making them atypical. In none of these studies reviewed could it be said that this aspect has been addressed in a satisfactory manner so far as the evaluation issues are concerned. In Reference 6, however, the topic is addressed for a personal development aspect, and in Reference 5 the topic is at least discussed.

- A good portion of the information contained in these studies is derived from self-assessed data; e.g., an aspect of an individual's life is assessed and reported by that person, or an aspect of a project is assessed and reported by those involved in the project. For certain aspects this is quite satisfactory particularly where "objective" data such as current occupational or educational status is reported. In others, however, which require more subjective judgement - such as the assessment of the influence of the program on subsequent personal decisions - a degree of reservation must be maintained since such judgements can be quite misleading.

Noting these general points, we can consider each of the studies.

A. Economic Impact - I (Reference 2)

This report makes a highly useful contribution through its categorization of Katimavik jobs, and the matching of those jobs against "standard" labour force classifications and rates. As discussed in Appendix A, we estimate that this yields an overestimate of the "true value of labour" of some 13%; (i.e. the estimate was $5.60/hr; we judge it to be $4.97/hr.)

../10

Nevertheless, the Econosult approach provides a continuing useful tool for analysis.

The analysis associated with the use of this data leaves, however, a good deal to be desired:

1. The value of materials and of equipment used in the Katimavik projects is a transfer from the sponsor and, therefore, should not be credited as a Katimavik contribution. This material and equipment is made available and contributed by the sponsor; as such, it is also available for uses other than in or through the Katimavik project - there is, therefore, what can be taken as an equal offsetting opportunity cost in its use, for no net gain.

2. On the other hand, the worth of the "Income in Kind" (such as the provision of food and lodging) provided to the Katimavik participants should be credited to the program.

../11

3. Further to this last point, no mention is made of the government (program) input over and above the "Income in Kind" provided - e.g., the $1000 per participant. The major substantive element which this Phase I report contributes is the estimate of the value of the labour.

B. Telephone Survey of Participants (Reference 3)

This report is based on a well-ordered questionnaire which, from an examination of the report and on the basis of the reputation of this firm in the survey field, was competently administered. We judge that the reported data can be relied on to be a fair portrayal of the situation relative to the sample.

The sample itself appears to be a fair representation of the population - with the exception of the male/female ratio.

In general, the analysis as completed, could be accepted - noting, however, that a measure of carelessness appears to have worked into individual figures. (It is difficult, for example, to see how an unemployment rate ("After" Katimavik) of 2% of females

and 6% of females (page 20) could result in an overall figure of 8% (Page 18).

The most serious flaw in the analysis is the conclusion that the unemployment rate for this population of Katimavik participants is 6.7%.

This figure was arrived at by taking the number of unemployed (27) as a percentage of the total population (403). However, 109 of the 403 are students who, unless it can be established that they were actively seeking part time work, should not be counted as part of the labour force. Accordingly, the unemployment rate should be 9.4%. This figure is still respectably lower than the 13.7% figure calculated by CRC for the population of this age group as a whole.

Correspondingly, the unemployment rate before Katimavik should be 31.6%.

This flaw in the CRC approach was corrected by the OpCan Program Evaluation Office report (Reference 4).

It should be noted, however, that the unemployment figures for the age group of participants in this program can be difficult to interpret due to the fact of a large student component particularly at the "Before Katimavik" stage. It would be fair to judge that those who have left education at this relatively early point are those who, as the most uncompetitive, need it the most - and are most vulnerable to unemployment - i.e., once the student group is removed from the population, the unemployed form a relatively large component of those out of school. It would be quite misleading to conclude that the program, itself, reduced the formal unemployment rate from 32% to 9%.

Further, in terms of the absolute numbers a reduction from 36 unemployed persons in this population "Before Katimavik" to 27 "After Katimavik", would be judged a quite normal progression for this age group and one which would be unsurprising, regardless of the program.

As a general comment, it could be noted that the OpCan report (Reference 4) added useful exposition on several aspects of the CRC survey.

../14

C. Economic Impact - II (Reference 5)

This report was also based on a well ordered questionnaire which appears to have been well administered. In general, therefore, we judge that the reported data can be relied on to be a fair representation of the views of this sample.

(As noted, this report records the desirability of having a control group and describes how the constraints on the study resources prevented its use in this case.)

The sample of sponsors and participants was selected on a project basis, and though the demographic representativeness of the sample, in relation to the population as a whole, is not established, there does not appear to be any serious reason to doubt its validity.

As with the CRC work, a degree of carelessness appears to have worked into these figures also. (In this case it is difficult, for example, to see how the percentages related to the "Influence of Katimavik on the decision to return to school" can total 107% (Page 22)).

../15

The two major methodological features of the report are:

1. The use of the "Willingness to Pay" approach to the estimation of the true value of labour; and

2. The use of the Statistics Canada Input/Output model for the estimation of the program's impact on the Canadian economy.

Our experience has been that the "Willingness to Pay" approach yields a fair estimation, so that in this case we would judge it gives a valid representation of the true value of labour.

On the other hand, the multiplier effect which is the dominant influence being brought to bear by the Input/Output model is not an easy one to interpret. While it certainly exists, the inference of the report (admittedly not explicitly claimed) is that if the funds had not been expended on Katimavik, then the Canadian economy would not have benefited from an extra $1.43 for each dollar spent (i.e. $2.43 were assessed as being generated for every $1 expended). In general, all economic activity has a multiplier effect and a good deal is of this $2.43 order of magnitude. Moreover, there could be some question

../16

as to whether the Katimavik projects closely match the economic categories used as inputs into the model (e.g., would the construction of social facilities provide the same stimulus as commercial construction?). Katimavik's projects undoubtedly provided some economic stimulus. We do not judge, however, that this stimulation supports a positive evaluation conclusion.

It is not possible, however, to judge how these data were treated to arrive at a "true" value estimate of $13.5 million. (The aggregate wage rate implied by this $13.5 million is $5.60 per hour.) The assessed wage rates are reported as a spread (e.g. "$5.00-7.00"); and the very largest group of sponsors would have paid only the minimum wage which is considerably less than $5.00.

Our assessment of the economic value of the work performed is lower than that of Econosult. We felt that an average hourly wage of $4.62 was justified by the data; that a 30 hour work week (as used in Reference 6) was a more realistic estimate; and that the work effort by participants for 16 weeks would be realistic also.

../17

This yields a figure of $8.2 million versus $13.5 million. We judge that our figures are more consistent with the earlier results of Reference 6, when an allowance is made for the difference in parameter values. A fuller discussion of the derivation of the $4.62 estimate and of the assessment of the relevant analysis in Reference 5, is given in Appendix A.

$0.7 million was identified as money available to and spent by the sponsors, because of the use of Katimavik resources. This figure should not be added to the benefits of Katimavik, however, as it would constitute double counting since we already allowed for the Katimavik labour contribution. This point is noted since, although the report does not count this amount, this discussion almost constitutes attribution to the program.

D. An Evaluation of Katimavik: Effectiveness; Effectiveness Related to Cost (Reference 6)

This assessment is clearly a highly competent piece of work in the treatment of the pyschological aspects (personal development, language training). Its treatment of economic topics is generally competent with a few weak areas.

../18

The significant weakness lies in the treatment of dollars expended by the Katimavik participants in the local communities. Although there is no doubt that this amount is expended, this is a distributional benefit rather than an addition to the national economy as a whole. The expenditures would concentrate on those communities which have the projects but to the loss of other communities. Consequently in the global balance sheet (pages 32-33) we would increase the deficit to $11 million.

E. Use of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Reference 9)

Early in 1985, the Bureau of Management Consulting together with a consulting firm assessed the feasibility of using off-the-shelf "personal development" tests in the Katimavik context. It was determined that the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was appropriate, robust and easily intelligible, and consequently to be used in a pilot test on Year VIII, (1984-85) graduates (N=96) and on a similar set of non-selected applicants (N=39) from a pool.

../19

The CPI, one of three proposed methods of obtaining effectiveness information, was designed to measure such things as poise, ascendancy, interpersonal adequacy, responsibility, tolerance, achievement potential, and interest modes. In a comparison with the many Katimavik objectives, these were judged relevant to the program's intentions.

The pilot test found no clearly identifiable and statistically significant differences between the two groups of persons. In a few cases, the comparison group actually scored higher than the Katimavik participants.

F. Sponsor Applications

200 sponsor applications were randomly selected from the total group of 403 applications for Program Year IX (85/86). These applications provided information on the participant work weeks which the sponsors anticipated on their projects. As such, they provided information on the work categories which could be expected. The analysis of these data is given in Appendix B.

../20

In general:

1. There is a sharp decline in Construction; with parallel increases in social service activities and in Recreation.

2. Sponsors appear to be placing much less emphasis on work to improve the natural physical environment; i.e., the environment outside of municipal parks.

G. Future Procedures

To address the incrementality concern raised at the start of this section, it should be standard procedure to use the non-selected applicants for Katimavik as a control group in future evaluations. The random nature of their non-selection means that this is an ideal population for the comparison of the effects of the program. The Program Evaluation staff at OpCan should be encouraged to take whatever steps are necessary to maintain the records which would make this group accessible for comparative studies; and to provide the resources to permit this control group technique to be used in future evaluations.

H. Summary of Information/Data Base Comments

In summary, the Information/Data Base yields:

1. Data on the value of Katimavik program parameters which appear reliable and, as such, are quite worthwhile;

2. Analyzed data/information, however, can only be classified as weak at best; but

3. In certain cases, individual items of data from different reports can be put together to support evaluation conclusions.

The evaluation conclusions which can be drawn vary markedly in their "conclusiveness" - and this degree varies, in turn, generally with the nature of the issue.

V. EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS

A. Individual Issue Conclusions

1. EVALUATION ISSUE #1: WHAT OPPORTUNITIES TO ACQUIRE WORK SKILLS THROUGH WORK EXPERIENCE ARE PROVIDED TO KATIMAVIK PARTICIPANTS, AND TO WHAT DEGREE ARE WORK SKILLS ACTUALLY ACQUIRED?

It is not possible to make a judgement with respect to the degree to which Katimavik provided the opportunity to acquire work related skills since none of the evidence addresses that specific question. The general work categories and sub-categories associated with a project can be identified - as, in fact has been done in Appendix B; but, the actual work assigned to a participant is not recorded. To make this point explicit through an example: a project could be a construction task but this does not necessarily mean that a participant will be employed using carpentry skills - he may be asked only to carry the lumber to the carpenters.

../23

On the question of the work skills actually acquired, however, it can be stated with a reasonable degree of confidence that about one-half of the Katimavik participants did acquire skills related to work in general, and that about 80% of these participants were able to apply their skills to some degree in their work at the time of the survey.

The degree to which the acquired skills were work-related, was highest in Atlantic Canada and Quebec. It seems fair to judge that a larger percentage of the jobs in those two regions parallel Katimavik-type jobs.

Analysis of sponsor applications leads to the view that the general pattern of these results should not change significantly for year IX. There has been an increase in social service activities and those related to parks, recreation and developments; with the propensity of Katimavik participants to go into public service jobs, the skills learned could well be more work-related in the future than in the past. (A fuller analysis of the sponsor applications is given in Appendix B.)

Katimavik could not, however, be viewed as the most cost effective way to bring about these skill acquisition results; as Reference 6, (Cost Effectiveness, page 14) states ".. the (useful skills acquired in Katimavik) are of a rudimentary nature when compared to those developed during an apprenticeship or four semesters at a technical college."

2. EVALUATION ISSUE #2 - TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE KATIMAVIK EXPERIENCE LEAD TO BETTER EMPLOYMENT HISTORIES FOR PARTICIPANTS?

The most notable change in the Katimavik population (from "Before" to "After" participation) was the decrease in those attending schools, and a corresponding move into work.

There is no evidence, however, that this is the result of any process other than normal maturing.

Nevertheless, there is good evidence that Katimavik influences about one-half of the work participants in their choice of future work; this is probably, but not necessarily, a benefit.

../25

Katimavik "graduates" participated in public sector employment to a much larger degree (35%) then the population as a whole (about 10%).

The percentage of unemployed among Katimavik graduates (8%) is significantly lower than for the comparable age group population (14%).

Those who participated in full time work after Katimavik, received wages which are 39 cents higher than the wages for those who participated in full time work before Katimavik.

What cannot be said, however, is that Katimavik has produced these last two effects - i.e., lower unemployment; higher wages. The experience of a comparable population who did not participate in Katimavik is not available for comparison. (And in the one instance in which a controlled comparison was made of Katimavik effects, admittedly in the personal development dimension and not the economic one, no improvement was found.)

../26

This point regarding unemployment bears some emphasis. The population in this age group "normally" undergo rapid and sharp changes in their occupation - e.g., in moves into and out of education. Unemployment statistics as they relate to "Before" and "After" the program can be quite misleading due to the fluctuations caused by such "normal" movements - all of which are part of the maturing which this population is undergoing, and which "normally" leads to increased employment.

3. EVALUATION ISSUE #3 - HOW DOES KATIMAVIK AFFECT THE SUBSEQUENT EDUCATIONAL HISTORIES OF PARTICIPANTS?

There are reasonable grounds to conclude that Katimavik influences about 40% of those participants who did return to education to make this choice, and about 50% of the students were influenced in their choice of programs.

In addition, students gained from having received training in a second language to the value of about $2,600. Such training could be estimated

../27

to be of significant worth for about one-third of the students due to the relevance of this training to their courses.

4. EVALUATION ISSUE #4 - WHAT IS THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF KATIMAVIK VOLUNTARY LABOUR?

We judge that the evidence supports the view that Katimavik voluntary labour is worth about $4.97 per hour - which for a typical 30 hours/week and 16 weeks of work yields a value of $2,386 per participant. (See Overall Commentary for further discussion.)

5. EVALUATION ISSUE #5 - WHAT BENEFITS ACCRUE TO THE COMMUNITIES WHICH HAVE BEEN THE SITE OF KATIMAVIK PROJECTS?

It can be concluded that the communities benefited from Katimavik as follows:

a. Value of Labour - the $2,386 per participant given above;

b. Local Expenditures - very roughly $12 million or $6,000 per participant.

../28

6. EVALUATION ISSUE #6 - WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON THE PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTICIPANTS?

The results from References 6 and 9 support the view that there is no well-founded evidence that Katimavik yields noticeable effects on the personal development of the participants; and, the well-founded evidence which does exist would support the view that there are no significant effects.

../29

B. Overall Evaluation Commentary

The contributions which each Katimavik participant makes to the national economy are the $2,386 in labour and the $2,600 in language training. These two items, totalling $4,986, have to be set against a program cost, as reported by the Katimavik program office, of some $9,337. (And, in fact, the value of the language training could legitimately be reduced to some $900 - for a total of some $3,300 - if the relevance of language training is allowed for.) The full cost of the program should not, of course, automatically be charged against the economic benefits. There are however, few well-supported significant benefits to employment or to other aspects of education, which are both well-supported and significant.

In comparing the effects of Katimavik against other experiences whose effects have been assessed certain similarities stand out:

1. Katimavik is comparable to some forms of military or "Outward Bound" type training in that it forms a period in which the individual undergoes some discomfort and stress. Having come through it, a feeling of nostalgia - certainly, a degree of allegiance - develops. This can be seen in the support given to the program by graduates.

2. Such experiences also lead to a sense of the development of positive qualities of leadership and character - and to a degree this sense is undoubtedly justified; it is easy, however, to over-assess this effect.

   But this support and the associated favourable view of the program on the part of the participants can be attributed much more to their subjective reaction than to any objective effect - in other words, the reaction of the Katimavik participants is typical of reactions to these types of programs.

APPENDIX A

ESTIMATED VALUE OF KATIMAVIK'S VOLUNTARY LABOUR

APPENDIX A

ESTIMATED VALUE OF KATIMAVIK'S VOLUNTARY LABOUR

I. The estimate of the value of Katimavik's voluntary labour is based on the following factors:

A. We judge that the sponsors (employers) are in the best position to judge the direct worth of the labour. Accordingly, we have assessed the worth based on the employers assessments as follows;

1. "Most employers would pay at the minimum wage" (Ref. 5, page 28): this was interpreted to mean that 50% would pay the minimum - which, in turn, was taken at a national average of $3.90. (see Ref. 2, page 28).

2. 61% would pay $5.00 or less (Ref. 5, page 28): removing the above 50% leaves 11%; these were assessed as willing to pay the average of $5.00 and $3.90, i.,e. $4.45.

3. Of the remaining 39%, 32% would pay $5.00-$7.00 (Ref. 5, page 28) - for an assessed average of $6.00; allowing for the remaining 7% led to an average of $6.60 for this group of 39%.

4. This approach gives an overall average $4.97.

B. For the number of hours worked per week, it was our judgement that the ASC procedure yielded the opportunity to develop deeper insights into the actual working of Katimavik, than that of Econosult. Consequently, the ASC assessment of 30 hours/week of actual work was used.

C. Finally, the statistics in Annex J of Ref. 1 combined with statistics given by the Katimavik Program Office indicate that participants work about 16 weeks.

II. Using these component figures yields a labour contribution of $2,385/participant. This figure would mean that for Year VII, for 4,000 participants, the overall contribution would be $9.5 million.

This figure is lower than the three figures derived by Econosult which, admittedly, have an intriguing convergence. We believe, however, that our estimate is consistent with these figures.

A. <u>Econosult Estimated Wages (Ref. 2)</u>: - it should be recalled that these figures are for "journeymen" tradesmen; Katimavik participants would have to be judged at a lower level of worth. Beyond this, in

this study, the 37.5 hours work week was used. The difference between the $12.5 million result and a $9.5 million estimate is due to the difference in these two factors - which has been discussed above.

B. "Willingness to Pay" Estimate (Ref. 5): for these figures, we have discussed our derivation of the hourly rate. In addition, again, the 37.5 hour figure was used.

C. Sponsor Estimates of Labour Replacement Cost (Ref. 5, page 32): the $14.4 million quoted in the Reference could not be checked. Accepting it, however, this is the type of subjective judgement which it is not easy to make - in particular, it would not be easy for the sponsors to estimate the efficiency with which trained workers could have executed the tasks. Accordingly, we are satisfied that the $14.4 million figure can be viewed as a "generous" estimate of a "true" $9.4 million performance.

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF SPONSOR APPLICATIONS FOR YEAR IX.

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF SPONSOR APPLICATIONS FOR YEAR IX

I. A sample of 200 (of the total of 403) sponsor applications was analyzed. The analysis was directed at the indications relevant to the future contribution of the program providing marketable job skills.

The only evidence was the description by the sponsor of the work to be performed. Accordingly, this description was used to match the work, in terms of work weeks, against the job classification system developed by Econosult.

The following points emerged:

A. Work Category

The table immediately below shows the distribution of the work weeks against the major work categories for both the earlier Econosult study (Ref. 2) and the sponsor applications:

WORK CATEGORY	% DISTRIBUTION ECONOSULT STUDY	SPONSOR APPLICATIONS
Construction	22	5
Social Service Activities	23	35
Parks, Recreation & Development	39	49
Silviculture	6	3
Archealogical	6	5
Miscellaneous	5	4
	101%	101%

It can be seen that the major change is a sharp decline in Construction; with some parallel increases in social service activities (a 52% relative increase), and in Parks, etc (with a 26% relative increase). In view of the inclination of Katimavik participants to go into public service sector jobs (Reference 3, page 30), it is of interest that the categories in which acquired skills relevant to that form of post-program employment (i.e. Social Service Activities plus Parks, Recreation and Development), have increased to 84%.

B. Sub-Categories

In terms of the sub-category classification, the following listing gives the categories in which there were major declines and those in which there were major increases:

MAJOR DECLINES	MAJOR INCREASES
Habitat/Campground Clearing	General (Parks) Cleanup and Maintenance
Building Renovations	Work with Elderly/ Handicapped
General (Building) Maintenance Repairs	Other Social Service
Tree Planting	General Work in Municipality
Trail Clearing	(Social Service) Research and Clerical Work.

One major inference is that there is relatively much less emphasis on the physical environment.

APPENDIX C

REFERENCES

APPENDIX C

REFERENCES

1. Katimavik Framework Study: Part I - Rationale, Evaluation Issues and Approaches; Part II - Component Profile. DPA Consulting Ltd. December 1983.

2. Economic Impact Assessment of the Katimavik Program: Phase I. Econosult/Lavalin. September 1985.

3. A Quantitative Research Study Conducted Among Katimavik Past Participants - Program Years I to V. Centre de Recherches Contemporaines, Ltee. June 1985.

4. Survey of Katimavik Past Participants - Program Years I to V. OpCan Program Evaluation Office. May 1985.

5. Economic Impact Assessment of the Katimavik Program: Phase II. Econsult/Lavalin. July 1985.

6. An Evaluation of Katimavik: Effectiveness, Effectiveness Related to Cost. Applied Sciences Corp. October 1981.

7. Katimavik (Program Evaluation) Summary Report. Secretary of State Program Evaluation Directorate. December 1981.

8. Katimavik Sponsors Application. OpCan Files. 1985.

9. Use of California Psychological Inventory. Memo to PED.